Minutes of the School of Science Spring 2014 Faculty Assembly  
Friday, April 18, 2014  
Informatics & Communications Technology Complex, IT 252

Faculty Present

Biology: Blazer-Yost, Bonnie; Kusmierczyk, Andrew; Lees, N. Doug (Associate Dean); Li, Jiliang; Marrs, James; Marrs, Kathleen (Associate Dean); Randall, Steve; Rhodes, Simon (Dean); Roper, Randall; Skalnik, David (Associate Dean); Watson, John C.

Chemistry & Chemical Biology: Anliker, Keith; Blacklock, Brenda; McLeish, Michael; Minto, Rob; Muhoberac, Barry

Computer & Information Science: Liang, Yao; Mukhopadhyay, Snehasis (Past President of the Faculty); Raje, Rajeev; Tuceryan, Mihran; Zheng, Jiangyu

Earth Sciences: Gilhooly, William; Licht, Kathy; Mandernack, Kevin; Martin, Pamela

Forensic & Investigative Sciences: Goodpaster, John; Londino, Gina; Picard, Christine

Mathematical Sciences: Boukai, Ben; Cowen, Carl; Misiurewicz, Michal; Mukhin, Evgeny; Sarkar, Jyoti; Shen, Zhongmin; Tarasov, Vitaly

Physics: Petrache, Horia; Ou, Zhe-Yu

Psychology: Ashburn-Nardo, Leslie; Devine, Dennis; Goodlett, Charles; Neal-Beliveau, Bethany (President of the Faculty); Salyers, Michelle (Secretary of the Faculty); Stockdale, Peggy; Williams, Jane

1. President Neal-Beliveau called the meeting to order at 9:01. It was so moved, seconded, and the agenda was unanimously approved.

2. Neal-Beliveau called for a motion to approve the Minutes of Fall 2013 Faculty Assembly (November 22, 2013). It was so moved, seconded, and the agenda was unanimously approved.

3. Reports from the Dean’s administration

a. Associate Dean Doug Lees
   - State income levels have been less than expected, resulting in reduced state budgets and 2% return from university appropriations. Our cost for this was $307,129. We have been asked to budget this amount again for 2014-1 in case state revenues continue to lag.
   - Fringe benefit rate changes from 43.72% in 2013-14 to 39.76% for 2014-15 for faculty has resulted in a savings of about $700K for the School. The decrease was attributed to more employees selecting the new, high-deductible health care option.
   - The School’s overall budget increased from $40,886,590 to $42,642,950.
   - The School has sent each department and FIS an amount of cash equivalent to a graduate stipend for the highest degree offered in order to boost graduate enrollment. The amount ($157K) will be added to the RIF accounts for the coming years.
   - The graduate support lines in the general fund accounts of the departments and FIS have been increased by 10% (minimum of $5K) for 2014-15. This provides an additional $108K for graduate support.
   - The enrollment bonus plan provided departments (5 and FIS) with $73,664 in 2012-13. Projections for 2013-14 are for the distribution to be a little over $100K.
   - Effective this round, we have increased the automatic raises for faculty advancement. As cash amounts to base they have become marginalized over the years by rising salaries and can result in less than 4% raises for some. The changes are as follows:
     - P&T from $3500 to $5000
     - Promotion to Full from $5000 to $6500
     - For tenure only from $2500 to $3500
For Promotion to Senior Lecturer from $2000 to $3000.
• Raises for were capped at 2% for the 3 categories of employees (faculty, professional and clerical/technical). The full amounts were given to the Chairs for allocation. An additional retention pool was allowed "to provide retention incentives for a small number of academic employees" (faculty only). Acting primarily on chair recommendations, an additional amount of ~0.5% was distributed to about 20% of School faculty. No extra fund was available to the other two employee categories in the School, but we did make recommendations beyond the 2% cap for several staff based on equity (good work, chair support, and low salaries relative to comparable individuals in the School and on campus). We have not heard back on these yet, but "no news is good news" in such cases.

Kevin Mandernack asked a question about cap for classroom and how are they accommodating that. Lees replied that a survey of classroom usage showed we are fine.

b. Associate Dean Kathy Marrs
• At the recent Honors breakfast, we recognized excellent students, faculty, and staff. There was an induction ceremony for the first class of the Honor’s Program. The SOS will do 2 inductions per year. We will have new opportunities for SOS Honor’s students, and they are fully admitted to the Honors College amenities as well.
• We held a career fair.
• The SOS had 41 of the “Top 100” students and a Goldwater Scholarship winner.
• 494 undergrads graduating (from December or May). In the STEP grant, we promised 10% increase for 5 years. We have hit the mark each year. We have to wait until December, but it looks good. Sunday of commencement will have the brunch too.
• “Direct Admit” applicants are up, too—22.5 increase over last year
• Spring previews are underway. This is the time when students are with parents and are trying to decide among schools. She thanked faculty for opening labs to tours and also for being part of the tours. 60% of the applicants are women. We have so many applicants for Science housing that we cannot take them all.
• Looking at advising models this summer and will do a strategic plan review to make sure we are in line with the initiatives (e.g. Honors program is already there).

Ben Boukai asked about the Career Fair. Marrs replied that it was well attended. Brenda Blacklock asked if it was just SOS career fair. Marrs replied that the recent Life Science career fair was just SOS, but we will do another one with Engineering. Blacklock commented that it looked like SOS majors were the minority of people who were targeted. Marrs replied that the fair was targeted to Life and Health Sciences, and that it may not be just premed, Biology majors. Blacklock said it would be nice to see opportunities for Chemistry majors. Marrs agreed, and also Physics and other departments. The next one with Engineering may be more tied to other majors.

c. Associate Dean David Skalnik
• Lilly is interested in strengthening ties with the School. Scott Sheehan is to be the contact person, and is learning about the School, or Departments, and our interests. One spinoff is the LGRAD program. The LGRAD program has been approved by the lawyers and administrators. We should start seeing applications in the upcoming cycle. One issue is how to advertise within the Lilly community. If you are interested, be sure your faculty website is up to speed. There will be other opportunities, e.g., career days.
• Research enterprise is flat, which is good news given the funding climate. We are slightly up in
dollars, but down in number of grants awarded (getting fewer, but bigger grants).
- IUCRG program -- this year the funding rate was 14%. The SOS had a hit rate of 19%, and 29% of the proposals involved SOS faculty.
- Since we last met, several new federal research grants have been awarded (John Goodpaster, Michael McLeish, Nigel Richards, Yao Liang, Greg Druschel, Pavel Bleher, Alexey Kuznetsov/Chris Lapish, Cathy Mosher).
- 3 new NSF career awards (Haibo Ge, Gavriil Tsechpenakis, Roland Roeder). We now have 7 in the School. Mandernneck asked, were all 3 from Math? Skalnik replied, No, also from Chemistry and Computer Science.

d. Associate Dean Jeff Watt – not able to be present

e. Dean Simon Rhodes
- Dean Rhodes started by saying he did not know about the parking issues before the faculty! He does not like it either. He does not like segregation. Parking near other staff or students, we learn about other people and things going on. He appreciates working with others, and that’s the IUPUI way. He agrees with a lot of the points that have been made about parking in the faculty comments.
- Talking about environment and what we value, you will see an email this morning. There have been some acts of vandalism against some of the Women in Science programs. We have put out announcements that this is not acceptable. We want to preserve our friendly environment.
- It is awards season, and Kathy Marrs mentioned the awards luncheon. It was a great event, and new awards are accumulating for our staff, faculty, and students.
- Andy Barth – Wilson Mentoring Award. We have a good track record there. This shows that we really value mentoring.
- Leslie Ashburn-Nardo has been elected a Fellow of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues.
- Devin Bready was awarded a Goldwater Scholarship.
- 2014 Chancellor’s Award for Excellence in Teaching – Debbie Herold.
- 2014 IUPUI Top 100 students – we have 41 students! We had 12 in the top 20 and we had the Top Male student.
- Simon Atkinson is now a Chancellor’s Professor.
- Alexey Kuznetsov won the IUPUI Research Trailblazer award. He could not be there because of travel, and Chris Lapish accepted the award on his behalf. This sends a nice message of the collaborative spirit in our School.
- Last year at the fall Assembly, Dean Rhodes showed the student Ahmed Malik. He has MD/PHD offers from 6 universities and has already turned down many programs, including IU and Northwestern. He may go to MI or NYU. This shows the achievements our students are accomplishing.
- Stephanie Metcalf was a very quiet student when she first arrived. Now she is a senior PLTL leader in chemistry. She was recently on television, on Inside Indiana Business describing PLTL in chemistry. She wants to do a PhD in cancer research and has at least 3 offers.
- We have put money in the budget to be available to our advisors to give to students in need – the “Last Mile.” Our advisors have a reasonable pool of money to use. Sometimes students cannot afford the last class, and they talk to advisors about difficulty finishing. We now have the ability to help a few students to help with the last class, or help with financial barriers to completion (e.g., outstanding fees). We budget some money for this, and have empowered advisors to be able to identify those in need.
• Doug Lees gave bullet points on the budget, but one thing he did not say because he is modest is that he realized that we were overcharged $434,000. During budget construction, he saved us a lot of money.
• This year we lose Bard, Chin, Rao, Stocum—4 amazing professors—to retirement. We thank them for their service.
• We really only meet like this 3 times a year. He wanted to look out and thank the faculty for their work. He said, “I am proud to be your colleague.”

Boukai asked if there were any plans on strategic plan implementation. Dean Rhodes replied that Kathy (Marrs) mentioned the Honors program and mentoring plans. A department Chair waved the copy of the plan in my face to make me change a decision the other day. This is good.

Bonnie Blazer-Yost asked if there any plans to address salary compression? Dean Rhodes replied that we do our best. We got 2% this year. President McRobbie said we would get up to and including 2% (3 schools likely went with zero and one likely asked for reductions). We tried to address a few issues this year and were able to address 20% of faculty in science. We are trying to address it, but it is tough. Part of the problem is new hires and the market rate. He cannot hire someone at too high of a rate to disrupt the system. We want the best faculty, but we cannot go to extreme places, which could cause problems for faculty. In the last 3 years, we may have lost one applicant (because of not matching request). He is sorry about that, but can live with it.

4. Report on SOS Student Satisfaction Survey (Jane Williams)
• Neal-Beliveau reminded us that Jane Williams is the point person for the new SOS survey and that there were 2 task forces this year. Williams then gave a summary of progress in these areas.
• We moved to online format, and updated to the lecture survey since we met last fall. Moving from paper to online, the response rates went down. Faculty were concerned, so we put together a task force. The group looked at the literature on best practices, and we have suggestions. We need to make some decisions as a faculty.
• Our experience with lower response rates is not unusual. Low course evaluation and online survey rates in the literature is common. SOS average was 39%, but varied by course level: lowest in 100-level (32%) and highest in graduate level (59%). This is consistent with the literature showing that closeness to the topic is associated with higher engagement.
• Literature shows about 60% is the best we will likely achieve. In online survey research, 30-40% is considered good. We are probably hitting the top expectation with graduate students and majors, but would probably need to do some things to increase lower level course response rates.
• ClassClimate is the product being used (most highly regarded across the country). No one else on campus is really addressing this, except in Heron. Molly Rondeau and Mark Federwisch helped set up a “class” to see how it would work on smartphones, iPads, etc. They will make some changes based on the subject line. But the system is simple to use. Williams also talked to people in the Testing Center about options to improve the system.
• Email will be sent to students April 25th – Mark Federwisch will send out an email.
• Matt Rust and Jane Williams will conduct a study – giving a survey to students to see who is responding and who is not. She recognized the irony here, but has money they can give to reward them for research survey.
• Once the student responds to one survey, ClassClimate gives students a page that shows they have others to complete (so they are not getting multiple emails).
• Faculty could set aside time in class for them to do it on their phone (you leave like you did with paper).

• Literature shows that incentives work. Some schools do lottery for iPads, gift certificates. Those may be extreme, but faculty could incentivize each student (e.g., extra credit). ClassClimate could print out certificate and give it to the faculty, but that creates more work for the teacher. Some places do a class level incentive—if the class achieves a certain level of participation, then the whole class gets a grade increase (e.g. 0.5%). Students get an initial email and 2 reminders. The reminders could tell people what the % responding in the class is so far. Faculty could give a psychologically meaningful (not necessarily practically meaningful) extra credit bonus. ClassClimate could also give a one-time email to faculty with class-wide response rate. We could set it up so individual faculty could opt in if they want.

Boukai asked should there be a reasonable incentive for participation, so that it is removed from our academic work, for example, a financial incentive to give students a reason to participate. To compensate, they will get a ticket, or some financial benefit to a student organization. Williams responded that some faculty are doing more. Boukai suggested he could do belly dancing to get students to respond.

Keith Anliker asked if the average response rate of 39% was the average of all students or the average of the section averages? Williams replied it was at the average of the sections. Anliker said this is disturbing because there are lots of small sections, so it skews the results. Anliker also said he got a note from a student about another faculty member (not himself) on the written comments. Also, he had a student who got the request to participate in the survey, but who had dropped the class. These are disturbing instances.

Williams replied that we have to get the names to the survey company weeks before the end of the semester, but past the last drop date. It may be that the student has not really dropped the class. The list of names gets pulled really late in the semester. She also reminded us that there’s error, even with pencil and paper. Sometimes students put in the wrong section number. There’s always some error in the process. One thing the online does better is that the comments are longer, more informative.

Anliker asked what date does the survey go away, how long do we have? Williams replied that Mark (Federwich) is setting that and she is not sure. She usually sets 7-10 days, and that will go in the email. We close it before finals so that it mimics the paper process.

Anliker added that his class meets the trailing Monday as the makeup day for others that were off for Labor Day. If the survey can close at the end of that day, it would be more helpful. Williams will ask Federwich. Anlicker said it should close at midnight on the very last day that classes meet. Williams agreed it would be an easy fix.

Dean Rhodes said he hesitated to mention this, but now there are noises that the campus will go to one evaluation for the whole campus. IU - Bloomington is going to one for this coming fall. There are some noises that it will happen at IUPUI soon, too. He apologized, but reiterated that this is what he is hearing. Williams added that even if we get hijacked, it will still be online.

Peggy Stockdale asked if we can customize for faculty members. Williams said we can set up a blanket reminder to give the email saying a certain % of your class has responded. So that if a faculty member wanted to give credit to the class for a good class response rate, the faculty could do that.

Vitaly Tarasov suggested, how about sharing the data with students. That would incentivize them. They are going to “Rate-your-professor.com,” why not get the information from us? He said another faculty member gave him this suggestion. Williams replied that other schools give
students access to other ratings if they complete one themselves.

Boukai suggested that the information be available for the faculty summary review form on line (the FAR reporting). Our teaching assignment is there, but not performance. The FAR system should have that filled in too.

Michal Misiurewicz said his responses were from a few people at the fringes -- a few very unsatisfied (who should be in a different class) and one very satisfied. This is really satisfaction, not evaluation. Williams agreed, saying yes, that is in the preamble. This cannot really be an evaluation.

Williams returned to the slides and showed 14 best practices – (see attached slides). We are doing 8 of them; we do not currently do 6 that were highlighted in the literature. She highlighted 2 she thought we could do easily. We could do a campaign -- posters, Oncourse notices. We could give incentives for departments, for example. IUPUI may be too decentralized to do something like giving students who respond early access to grades. An email from the Dean or Chairs saying to students why this is important could be helpful. Entry-level courses may be freshmen who don’t know yet how important the evaluations are.

Williams described 6 best practices for faculty: Deans, Chairs and faculty communicate to students the importance of their input; Faculty emphasize the intended purpose of the ratings; Faculty strongly encourage students to participate; Faculty assign students to complete as part of course grade; Faculty provide incentives; and Faculty set an in-class time. These can send a message to students that their input matters and we listen.

Boukai said that we have standards in our syllabi. Would it make sense to have a uniform language from the Dean’s office in our syllabi to put in? Williams said that would be a great idea.

Misiurewicz suggested, why not introduce instructor satisfaction survey at the same time. It could include comments about the class and disseminate both together. Boukai said sometimes truth is hard to hear.

Someone asked if we will vote on changes now. Williams said she was just bringing it to faculty. She is not sure what requires a vote. Incentives could be done easily.

Michael McLeish asked about public data. Williams said she was surprised that some faculty are supporting public showing of this data.

Snehasis Mukhopadhyay asked why are we worried about overall response rate, when we need meaningful response. If someone fills in all zeros, it is not useful. Williams said that the issue is that people were upset that the response rate is so low, so are there simple things we could do to improve the process.

Jim Marrs said that how the data are used could be rethought since there are flaws in the system. Williams agreed, yes, this is one small piece in the dossier. Blazer-Yost said that it is not a small piece of P&T, even thought it SHOULD be. In reality, that is not the case. Neal-Beliveau said that in preamble, we do say that this is only a small piece of the teaching evaluation.

Williams showed a summary slide (Response rates are a universal issue; Lower level classes are where we could show the most improvement; Could provide some incentive in the form of course credit; Can advertise with posters/emails; Could have Deans/Chairs send out email to students We are doing what we can administratively but each faculty member must also actively help with the process)

Williams said we do not have enough time to go into this, but we did have a committee to make changes to forms for labs and active learning sections. There is nothing in the bylaws that says we have to vote on them. We did vote for the Lecture form because they affected so many people.
They tried to make changes like the lecture items. She can send out the items to the school. The forms have been through some process, with faculty input, but there’s no reason we can’t entertain other suggestions. Neal-Beliveau agreed that most faculty may not be in a place to comment on these items since the classes are taught by fewer people.

John Watson suggested we send them to each department’s curriculum committee. Because these are largely undergraduate courses, and those people would be most familiar. We will not get put into place until next fall. Tarasov suggested that we make it open to all faculty, so we all have an idea of the items. Williams will send it over the listserv.

Rajeev Raje asked what goal are we hoping to achieve. Williams replied, 60% for each class.

5. Discussion of proposed change to the School of Science Bylaws

Neal-Beliveau showed faculty the proposed change highlighted in the attached Appendix and said that the Steering Committee wanted to present this at the Faculty Assembly to offer an opportunity for discussion before a vote. We will need to have an electronic vote, but wanted to bring it here for discussion first. Currently, the bylaws say Emeritus Faculty are nonvoting, unless it was determined by faculty that they could become a voting faculty member again. The Math department brought a proposal to allow people within the School who are highly invested in their department (and the School) the right to vote. For example, an academic specialist or research faculty who are highly involved in departmental affairs. If a department wanted this, then the department could create a case and bring it to the School faculty. We would like to offer a change to the bylaws such that an individual department could bring the case of an individual faculty forward for voting privileges.

Stockdale said she has great respect for our Emeritus, but Emeritus is not an employee, why would they have the ability to vote? An Emeritus is relinquishing that part of their role. Neal-Beliveau noted that the current bylaws do allow them to vote if other faculty approve.

Mukhopadhyay asked what would the criteria be? Neal-Beliveau said it would be up to the department to make the initial selection. We (Steering Committee) talked about creating guidelines, but have not done that. A department might consider years of service.

Steve Randall said we should be explicit in the description of what it means for faculty approval (e.g., vote).

Watson asked, how do we do that? We need to specify ‘vote’ in the bylaws. He also pointed out that the list of faculty in the bylaws does not currently include academic specialists.

J. Marrs asked, why not just change the status to a voting status. Why not just make them that position? Dean Rhodes replied, without discussing specifics, in one case, the person moved from a voting status to non voting, because it was a better fit overall for how she fit into our mission. He sees Marrs’s point, but those decisions are based on employment for the school, and mission, and person. We cannot change ranks unless it is fully justified (not just to give them voting status).

Carl Cowan said that this will happen rarely, will be case-by-case. We cannot figure out all the details ahead.

J Marrs, reiterated, why not change status? A person is making a choice of being a specific status. He said he was trying to understand the issue, but not make it more complicated.
Neal-Beliveau said it sounds like there are needs to tweak the wording.

Charley Goodlett asked how long should this last, if a person is given voting rights.

Watson said one issue is whether the change is a good one, separate from the wording. He said he was wondering out loud if this is a reward for certain individuals. But is this the right tact to take? What if someone is nominated and voted against, then what will happen? We would need clear criteria. This can be very complicated, and damaging.

Tarasov clarified the rationale for this, and suggested that person should keep voting status as long as they have their rank. If they change their responsibilities to the department, they may be more involved, but not at a level to change rank.

Boukai asked about rank within department, does this affect whether departments have a say in who can vote there? Watson said that the departments chose who can vote within department. Bylaws are for the school level. Neal-Beliveau added that the bylaws allow lecturers to vote at the School level, but not at university level (IFC). Boukai said that departmental bylaws can change, and they can vote within department. But suggested not change it to vote at the School level. Neal-Beliveau said that this was brought forth from a department who wanted people to be able to vote at the School level. Boukai said that the department would need to realize that this may not pass, and the departments may be happier to keep them voting there.

Randall asked what is the advantage to the School Assembly to add an individual person? We could invite people if they wanted to speak. Neal-Beliveau said this was a request from a department who felt that they had members of the faculty should be able to vote at the School. Randall said that they can speak in their departments and vote there. This proposed change does not make sense to him. Tarasov replied that the suggestion was from the department because faculty are so involved in the school life and it is better to have the possibility that they have a say.

Neal-Beliveau said that she will bring this pack to the Steering Committee. And we can decide on the next steps based on feedback from today.

6. Discussion of change to IUPUI Parking

Neal-Beliveau showed us one thing on parking – what we pay matters and where we park matters!

What we pay will change, and where we park will change. They are increasing rates and combining A and B permits into a single employee (EM) permit. Employees will no longer be able to park in the garages. She reminded us that John Watson was gathering emails comments from faculty.

Neal-Beliveau suggested we could have a special meeting just about parking.

Dean Rhodes said it sounds like that Parking Services are already rethinking some of the changes.

Watson said that there is a suggestion to allow EM permits to park in the Blackford St. Garage. Dawn Rhodes (Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration) said that they are thinking they may open the garage to employees, but at the garage permit rate. Otherwise, their business model may be adversely affected.

James Hill asked what are other schools saying? Dean Rhodes replied that others are concerned
too, but our corner is affected most. Hill said he thought Purdue schools were getting short end of the stick. Most parking is at the other end of campus. They are not being forced out like we are.

Mukhopadhyay said that they are viewing parking as a business versus a service for the university. What will they do with the profit? Dean Rhodes said that Vice Chancellor Rhodes said that the goal is to make money. Goodlett added that the push was from the Trustees. Dean Rhodes said in budgeting, he will say that the parking should be segregated out—they are not a service unit.

Misiurewicz said this is not just about parking, but how Central administration affects faculty and staff.

Stockdale added that employers of choice should include staff input. Neal-Beliveau agreed that staff having to pay is a huge hardship, and not have been involved is wrong.

Neal-Beliveau will set up a time and place to meet soon to discuss parking issues and will invite Vice Chancellor Rhodes. Andrew Kusmierczyk said to please ask her to provide clear information.

Mandernack asked if we can get parking data from other places. Goodlett replied that they have the other data, and the parking goal is to be at the median of peer situations (Louisville, Cleveland). Kusmierczyk asked if our salary also was at the median.

(There was a lot of discussion here at the same time.)

Goodlett suggested that we need to act quickly. This will start next month.

Neal-Beliveau agreed. We will try for next Friday, maybe afternoon. She will query Chairs, Dean, and the Parking Office.

Meeting adjourned at 10:42.
AGENDA

1. Call to order and adoption of the agenda

2. Approval of Minutes of Fall 2013 Faculty Assembly (November 22, 2013)
   To download the minutes, go to: http://sos.science.iupui.edu/facultycouncil/Fall%20Assembly%20Minutes%202011-22-13.pdf

3. Reports from the Dean's administration
   a. Dean Simon Rhodes
   b. Associate Dean Doug Lees
   c. Associate Dean Kathy Marrs
   d. Associate Dean David Skalnik
   e. Associate Dean Jeff Watt

4. Report on SOS Student Satisfaction Survey (Jane Williams)

5. Discussion of proposed change to the School of Science Bylaws of the Faculty
   Proposed change highlighted in attached Appendix.

6. Discussion of change to IUPUI Parking

7. Call for nominees for SOS representatives to IFC and Secretary of the SOS Faculty

8. Old business

9. New business

10. SOS Standing Committee Reports

11. Adjournment
Appendix: Proposed change to the School of Science Bylaws of the Faculty

SECTION I. FACULTY

Subsection 1. Membership

The faculty of the Purdue University School of Science, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, henceforth known as the FACULTY, shall consist of VOTING FACULTY and NONVOTING FACULTY. Meetings of the faculty as a whole shall be known as FACULTY ASSEMBLIES.

The VOTING FACULTY shall consist of members of the School of Science holding full-time tenured or tenure-track academic appointments at the Professor ranks (i.e., Professor, Associate Professor and Assistant Professor), and full time non-tenure track appointments at the Lecturer (i.e. Senior Lecturer and Lecturer) and Clinical Professor ranks (i.e. Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Assistant Clinical Professor).

The NONVOTING FACULTY shall consist of members of the School of Science holding full-time academic non-tenure track appointments at the Research Professor (i.e. Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, and Assistant Research Professor) and Scientist (i.e. Scientist, Associate Scientist, and Assistant Scientist) ranks, and members determined by the Voting Faculty to have faculty status.

Emeritus members of the School of Science shall also be nonvoting faculty unless otherwise determined by the voting faculty to have voting status. The Voting Faculty can grant voting status to specific individuals from the Nonvoting Faculty on a case-by-case basis, following departmental approval.
Committee to examine on-line end of semester surveys

• Members
  – Jane Williams, Psychology
  – John Watson, Biology
  – Michael Yard, Biology
  – Luoding Zhu, Math
  – Matt Rust, Deans Office

• Call was to examine best practices for improving response rates of online surveys and make suggestions to the school
Response Rate Concerns

• Lower response rate is typical with online surveys
• Fall 2013, SOS response rate average = 39%, sd = 16%,
• Varies by course level
  100 – 32% (4-76%)          200 – 35% (0 – 66%)
  300 – 38% (0 – 67%)          400 – 43% (0 – 80%)
  500+ - 59% (0 – 100%)
Committee Activities

• Reviewed the extant literature
• Communicated with other depts/schools on campus who use Class Climate to benchmark process
• Tested the system as a student
• Investigated options within Class Climate
• Conduct study on Spring responders and non-responders (to be conducted in May)
Review of Literature

• Fairly large literature base
• Similar findings to our school
• Incentives work
• Students closer to the content/department more likely to respond (i.e., majors, grad students), women more likely to respond, gets better over time
14 Best Practices suggested for Coordinator/Director of System

**Current doing 8 of these**
- Manager of system must be independent of faculty
- Specify purpose of the ratings
- Assure ease of access
- Monitor use of technology
- Assure anonymity and confidentiality
- Provide instructions on use
- Maintain a user-friendly system
- Send reminders to all students before and during (we do during)

**Not currently doing 6 of these**
- Plan ad campaigns to inform students *
- Provide school-wide incentives (lottery; ipad, gift certificate)
- Acknowledge and reward faculty/depts that meet target response rate
- Promote donor/alumni contributions of a dollar for every form completed
- Communicate the notion that assessment is part of culture and student responsibility *
- Permit early access to final grades

*Easily Implemented/low cost
6 Best Practices suggested for Faculty and Administrators

Faculty and Administrators (/?6)

• Deans, Chairs and faculty communicate to students the importance of their input
• Faculty emphasize the intended purpose of the ratings
• Faculty strongly encourage students to participate
• Faculty assign students to complete as part of course grade
• Faculty provide incentives
• Faculty set an in-class time
Options within Class Climate

• Students already receive up to two reminder emails – could include current course level response rate in email
• Faculty can receive a one-time email about their current response rate
• If we timed this one-time email at the very end of the survey period, faculty could determine the class response rate and assign some extra credit (e.g., .5% of final grade) to the entire class if the class meets some pre-determined %
• Not all faculty would have to participate, but would have that option
• Is option for student to print out a verification page to turn in to instructor – but this would add to instructor time
Ran Test Class

- Made up a mock class and sent ourselves the email invitation
- Easy to access
- Worked on a smart phone
- Will make some changes on the subject line and initial email message to students
Summary

• Response rates are a universal issue
• Lower level classes are where we could show the most improvement
• Could provide some incentive in the form of course credit
• Can advertise with posters/emails
• Could have Deans/Chairs send out email to students
• We are doing what we can administratively but each faculty member must also actively help with the process
Ad hoc committee on survey revisions

- Members
  - Keith Anliker, (Chemistry)
  - Horia Petrache (Physics)
  - Jennifer Nelson (Earth Science)
  - Lingma Acheson (CIS)
  - Denise Slayback-Berry (Biology)
- Completed a survey revision to the Lecture forms which were used in Fall 2013
- Forms for Labs, Recitations, Active Learning Sections have not been updated (20 + years)
- Reviewed and made suggested changes to current forms
- Vote on as a faculty? Or Simply Adopt?
The lab instructor is careful and precise when answering questions
The lab instructor deals fairly and impartially with students experiments/assignments
The lab instructor is available to student for questions
The lab instructor evaluates my work quickly enough to benefit me
The lab instructor communicates clearly
The lab instructor was clear in explaining the lab procedures
The lab instructor graded assignments in a consistent manner
The lab instructor graded my assignments fairly
The labs stimulated my learning and interest
The use of laboratory equipment was satisfactorily explained
There was ample opportunity to ask questions in the lab section
The instructor informed the class about proper safety procedures
Eliminated Lab Items

- The lab instructor demonstrates formal knowledge of the topic
- The lab instructors shows enthusiasm when teaching
- The lab instructor offers specific suggestions for improvement
- The lab instructor speaks English clearly
- The lab instructor prepared me for material covered in this section
- The lab instructor gives each student a fair share of his/her time
- The lab instructor has the potential for being a competent career teacher.
- I generally found the lab sessions valuable
- The lab section was a valuable part of this course
- Students received individual attention in the lab section
- Generally, the equipment used in the lab was adequate and reliable
- The difficult of the material is appropriate for the level of this course
- In this course I am developing my writing skills
- This course is improving my ability to think critically
Recitation - 14 item Draft
6 point scale (SD-SA, NA)

- The recitation instructor clarified the lecture material
- The recitation instructor is careful/precise when answering questions
- The recitation instructor is available during office hours.
- The recitation instructor deals fairly and impartially with students
- The recitation instructor effectively supplemented the lecture information
- The recitation instructor shows enthusiasm when teaching
- The recitation instructor evaluated my work quickly enough to benefit me
- The recitation instructor communicates well
- The recitation instructor graded assignments in a consistent manner
- The recitation section was a valuable part of this course
- There was ample opportunity to ask questions in the recitation section
- Student received individual attention in the recitation section
- I generally found the recitation section valuable
- The recitation instructor responded to my emails
Eliminated Recitation Items

- The recitation instructor gives each student a fair share of time
- The recitation instructor thoroughly understands the lecture/assignment
- The recitation instructor speaks English clearly
- The recitation instructor discovered my trouble areas
- The recitation instructor graded my papers fairly
- The recitation instructor has potential to be a competent career teacher
- The recitation section was well-integrated with the lecture
- The difficulty of the material is appropriate for the level of the course
- In this course I am developing my writing skills
- This course is improving my ability to think critically
Active Learning – 13 item Draft
6 point scale (SD-SA, NA)

• My instructor/facilitator has developed effective class sessions
• My instructor/facilitator displays enthusiasm about this class
• My instructor/facilitator deals fairly and impartially with students
• My instructor/facilitator is actively helpful when students have problems
• My instructor/facilitator readily maintains rapport with students
• My instructor/facilitator seems to care about whether I learn the material
• I would enjoy taking another course from this instructor/facilitator
• I understand easily what is happening in class sessions
• I generally find the class sessions valuable
• In the class sessions I am motivated to do my best work
• The class sessions clarify the content of the course
• The class sessions help me to do better on the exams
• The class sessions help me to better understand the material
Eliminated Active Learning Items

• The class sessions help me understand difficult concepts
• The class sessions help me learn the material
• The class sessions stimulate my interest in the subject
• Overall this course is among the best I have ever taken
• Overall this instructor/facilitator is among the best teachers I have known
• The difficult of the material is appropriate for the level of the course
• In this course I am developing my writing skills
• This course is improving my ability to think critically.